

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and the personal interview conducted on June 16, 2005 with the examiner, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 36 have been canceled. New claims 37-49 have been added without adding any new matter.

Claims 29-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for not being enabled by the specification. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

This issue was discussed at the personal interview, where applicant noted that the claims do not recite a "*separate* data structure portion and attribute portion" as the examiner claims. Claim 29 merely recites context description data comprising a data structure portion and an attribute portion. As the Examiner admits, the disclosure supports both a data structure portion and an attribute portion. Furthermore, the claimed structure is clearly supported by Figures 73-76, all of which discuss the configuration/contents of the context description data. In addition, the figures show the data structure of the context description data (see the Brief Description of the Drawings for Figures 73-76). In addition, Figures 69-76 show the "score" attribute in various configurations.

As a result of this discussion, the examiner agreed to withdraw the rejection, making it moot.

Claims 29-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Mauldin *et al.* These claims have been canceled, making the rejection moot.

Furthermore, at the personal interview, it was discussed in detail that the invention relates to context description data that is *separate* and *different* from the video data. The Examiner suggested that the claims should be amended to clarify this feature of the invention. Furthermore, the examiner suggested that claims directed to hierarchically arranged context description data could overcome the references. Accordingly, new claims 37-49 have been added with these suggestions in mind.

The Examiner cites elements 18 and 20 of Figure 2 in Mauldin as teaching context description data as recited in the claims. However, as discussed at the personal interview, item 18 is *audio* data, and item 20 is *video* data, that are input into the Mauldin apparatus. From the specification, it is clear that the audio data 18 and video data 20 are actual audio and video data (see col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 30). This audio and video data are comprised of the audio and video skimmed sequences that output by the Mauldin device.

New claim 37 recites an input unit operable to input content description data including:

a "data structure portion" including a "plurality of segments each for describing one of said plurality of scenes of media content" and an "attribute portion" including: "context attribute having a value for describing a context of one of said segments" a "plurality of importance attributes each associated with one of said segments and having a value representing a degree of contextual importance of said corresponding one of said segments" and "link information showing linkage to at least one corresponding segment". The cited reference fails to teach such data, and thus claim 37 is patentable over the reference.

Claims 42 and 47 also recite context description data of a format that is not found in the prior art, and thus are also patentable over the reference. The remaining claims depend on one of claims 37, 42, and 47, and thus are patentable over the references for at least the same reasons as their parent claims.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32161US1.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48540

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: February 13, 2006